

The number of possible spatial and temporal contexts of emission and reception for those stimuli that are instrumental in the formation of autonomous-aesthetic phenomena is, when those spatial and temporal contexts are regarded generically, finite. Were it not, it would be impossible to speak of modern art as such, it would only be possible to speak of recently created art. Were it not there would not in all probability be an internal continuity in the history of art. The number of possible spatial and temporal contexts of emission and reception for those stimuli that are instrumental in the formation of autonomous-aesthetic phenomena is, when those spatial and temporal contexts are regarded specifically, infinite. Were it not, recently created art never could never would be modern--because it is, all valid art is, when created, inescapably modern. Were it not, there would not be an ineluctable internal continuity in the history of art. Pause and think about the spatial and temporal contexts of emission and reception for those stimuli that were instrumental in the formation of a particular work of art Lytton Strachey and the Bloomsbury Group: His Work, Their Influence of Michael Holroyd for example. In what ways are the spatial and temporal contexts of emission and reception for those stimuli that were instrumental in the formation of that autonomous-aesthetic phenomenon not unlike those spatial and temporal contexts of emission and reception for stimuli that were instrumental in the formation of autonomous-aesthetic phenomena in other historical periods? [What are the patterns of repetition of those spatial and temporal contexts of emission and reception that can be identified for works of art created in England? What are the patterns of repetition of those spatial and temporal contexts of emission and reception that can be identified for Western European art in general? How are the English patterns of repetition of those contexts similar to/unlike the Western European patterns of repetition of those contexts?] In what ways are the spatial and temporal contexts of emission and reception for those stimuli that were instrumental in the formation of that work of art unlike those spatial and temporal contexts of emission and reception for those stimuli that were instrumental in the formation of autonomous-aesthetic phenomena created in all other historical periods? Know that the answers to those questions are incarnated in works of art.